

The Converted Catholic

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

For the instruction of Protestants regarding Romanism and for the enlightenment and conversion of Roman Catholics to the Evangelical Faith.

Published by

CHRIST'S MISSION
EVANGELICAL—NON-SECTARIAN.

Founded by the late, the Rev. James A. O'Connor, 1883.

BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., Director and Editor.

331 West 57th Street.

NEW YORK.

Vol. XXXI.

FEBRUARY, 1914.

No. 2.

CONTENTS

	Page
The Late, the Rev. James A. O'Connor, Portrait.....	42
Editorial Notes—Materia	43
" " —Father Schmidt	45
The Roman Church in Politics, By Samuel H. Lee.....	51
Money Under False Pretenses, by I. Q.....	55
Letter to Cardinal Gibbons, XXIII, By Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D.	56
Bishop Robert L. Rudolph, M.A., D.D., Portrait.....	60
The Pope's Liberty, By Charles Eaton.....	61
Parochial Schools, By L. Q.....	63
The Immunity of the Priest, By Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D., ..	65
Evolution of Woman's Situation in the Philippines, By Filicidad C. Guerrero	69
Friendly Warning to Parents, By Madam Lopez Rodriguez.....	72

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, POSTPAID.

All subscriptions are payable annually in advance.

Subscription per year.....	\$1.50	To Ministers and Missionaries.....	\$1.00
Single copy.....	15	Twenty or more copies, each....	10
Ten copies to one address, per year, each	1.25	Agents, 20 or more copies per year, each	1.00

Subscription per year in English money, Six shillings threepence.

Remittances should be made by Check, P. O. Money Order, Express Order or Draft on New York, made payable to Christ's Mission or to The Converted Catholic, 331 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York. Cash should be sent by Registered Mail. United States postage stamps received in small quantities and small denominations. Do not send stamps above ten cents each. Do not send Canadian or other foreign stamps or money.

Expiration. The date on the address label, on the wrapper, indicates the month and year of the expiration of the subscription. It is a bill when the subscription price is past due, and a receipt after payment is made and the date is changed. No other acknowledgment will be made of payments in renewal. Acknowledgment by letter is unnecessary, and is expensive, laborious and wasteful of much valuable time.

Change of Address. In making changes, send both old and new address.

Correspondence. Address all correspondence to the Director of Christ's Mission, 331 West 57th Street, New York City.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as second-class matter.



The Late, the Rev. James A. O'Connor,
Founder of Christ's Mission
and of
The Converted Catholic.

The Converted Catholic

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."—Luke 22: 32.

Vol. XXXI

FEBRUARY, 1914

No. 2

EDITORIAL NOTES

God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth. John 4: 24.

As our purpose in these articles is to show how utterly impossible it is for the devout Roman Catholic to worship in spirit and in truth because of his dependence upon the faithfulness of the priest, the following cases will still further demonstrate that, not only in the requirement of "Intention," but even in that of "*Materia*," the people are frequently deceived by their unscrupulous ministers.

The Church teaches that the *Materia*, or matter, required for the Mass consists of a wafer made of pure wheat flour and the pure wine of grapes. Without these there is no true sacrament.

In the Diocese of Malaga, Spain, I met a priest, who, having made arrangements with a prominent lady of the town to say the Mass of thanksgiving forty days after the birth of her child, found that he had forgotten to provide himself with the necessary wafer. So he cut from a piece of white paper a circle of the proper size and said the mock Mass with that. The lady paid him five dollars for her idolatrous worship.

When the Capuchins went to Colombia they were met on their arrival in the Diocese of Santa Marta by a certain young priest. He was very well disposed, but his ignorance was phenomenal. He stayed two or three days at the Mission House before going back to his parish in the mountains. His ignorance was a source of great diversion to the friars, as all they could tell or show him of the modern improvements of civilization seemed to him like fairy tales. One day he remarked: "Over there in Spain I suppose there is so much wine that nearly every priest may use it in the Mass." The monks were amazed.

"What?" they said, "Do not all the priests here say Mass with wine?" "Oh, no," he answered, "We say it with *rum*. Rum is the only thing we have!" He also said that it was the custom of many Colombian priests to use a little cake of coarse corn meal, which was the common native bread, in place of the required wafer.

This called for an investigation, with the result that the following facts were reported to Rome. The young priest above referred to certified, over his signature, that he had celebrated Mass with wine only when he went to the Cathedral (*once* since he was ordained, two years previous) and that on that occasion Father ——— gave him a little wine, about two ounces, which he took home. But it was such a novelty that he allowed his mother to taste it. He could not say how many Masses he had celebrated with what remained. The priest of Guamachall also certified that when Father ——— was made bishop he ordered all the priests to send to him for wine for the Mass. This priest declared that he had to pay the bishop twenty dollars, Colombian money (about \$8), for a bottle of wine, or else had to say sixty Masses "to the intention of the bishop."*

Of course this priest could not afford to send to the bishop for any more wine for some time. When the Capuchins went to the bishop with the result of their investigation and the threat that he would be deposed upon the report being sent to Rome, he answered that it was not his fault. He had plenty of wine but the priests did not send for it, and he could not be held responsible.

It was also discovered that the former bishop had made a trip to Europe and brought some wine back with him. When he died, he left about one hundred bottles of wine. His successor, who, by the way, was the most miserly man imaginable, thought that by obliging the priests to buy the wine he could reimburse

* To celebrate "to the intention" of a bishop or of another priest means that the priest who says the Mass does not receive the stipend, but the bishop or the other priest does. In this case the bishop would receive the stipend of sixty Masses, which, at five dollars each, would bring him in \$300, in exchange for one bottle of wine! The writer knows that some of the cardinals, as well as the pope, celebrate what they call *la misa gorda* (the fat Mass). That is, they collect Masses from nearly all the religious orders of the world, and uniting all their "intentions" celebrate one Mass for the lump sum of money.

himself for what he had spent on his consecration. How much wine he had sold we could not ascertain, but we found out through a young man, his attendant, that he still had twenty-two bottles left, and this was the fourth year after his consecration. Through the Custom House official we also discovered that he had not imported any wine. We were assured upon reliable authority that similar conditions existed throughout Colombia, as well as the other South American republics.

I well recall how one Colombian priest claimed for himself special merit because he used the flour of the plantain (a species of banana) for making his wafers, instead of the ordinary corn meal. He tried to convince me that the plantain was the Tree of Life referred to in the Bible, and declared that he could quote many passages of Scripture to prove it. I urged him to give me the references, and he promised to write them down and send them to me, but I am still waiting for them!

Here, in the United States, we do not know of any priest who substitutes anything else for the required *Materia*, but we know of many who mix unconsecrated wine with the consecrated. That is to say, they often indulge in suppers and midnight revellies, sometimes lasting till daybreak, and then regardless of the requirement of the Church that a priest should be fasting when he says the Mass, they go to the Church to celebrate, and then to bed till afternoon, and this not out of devotion to duty, but out of their devotion to the "holy stipend."

Lack of space obliges us to cut short this article, but in our next issue we hope to give our readers some instances of idolatry, right here in New York.

Father Schmidt

The world was shocked by one of the most terrible crimes that the annals of criminology have ever registered, perpetrated by the above-mentioned priest. We have been awaiting proceedings before mentioning it in the columns of our publication. In December last we received a letter from abroad, in which the writer says: "I lament such crimes, but in the event of happening I am glad it has happened in the United States. The world will see how justice is done. In our country the Church would work so that such a brute

would be set free." I answered that I expected justice, but I was not glad that such a crime should be perpetrated in our country.

We purpose to take up this crime as a subject for arousing the American public to a perfect understanding of the situation we are in. For the present, we wish to answer in the briefest possible way some questions which have come to us from different parts of the country, v. g.

Quest.: Do you believe Schmidt insane? Of course, not! If he is insane, he is insane after the fashion of popes, cardinals, bishops and priests. Do you think they would make the claims they do if they were sane? The pope, with his claim of God's vicar on earth, Lord of Lords, endowed with supreme powers from above and gifts such as those which make him infallible and sinless, is the craziest man in the world and the most dangerous. I am glad he is shut up in the Vatican. If he should receive an inspiration to kill me he would not take the trouble to cut me up and throw my body into the Hudson, under the shadow of might; he would do it in a more dignified and ostentatious way.

Quest.: "Do you believe that Schmidt could have been deceived by an illusion? I mean to say that he might have thought that he really heard a voice from Heaven requiring the sacrifice. Could it be possible? We hear so much about visions that one might think he was under a strong hallucination."

Ans.: I have had a large experience in dealing with insane people, not only in convents, where one may see all sorts of insanity, but in my position as confessor I have been called to administer my office in insane asylums. I must say that many a time I have been deceived by persons who were insane, and whom I considered sane. But after some experience I could detect the signs of insanity a mile away. There is always some weak spot in the insane person. I have not seen any sign of insanity in Schmidt's case. On the contrary, everything reveals such great skill that one wonders whether it is not the result of long criminal practise.

The crime, in my judgment, reveals a plan, carried out with the most well-calculated means to conceal the criminal.

If he had been under the illusion that he had to sacrifice his victim he would not have concealed the crime. He would have come out defiantly, insisting that he was the only sane man in the world. The case is plain to me. He was consistent with his theology. He had sinned; his sin was going to be revealed. He was obliged to avoid the worse evil, "*vitanda pejora*," as his theology says. He concluded that between the scandal and the secret disappearance of a girl the latter was more expedient, and so went about to accomplish it. I would rather believe that the girl herself consented to be sacrificed for the sake of the Church. It is not at all improbable that a man of his type could persuade a simple-minded girl, who feels herself guilty, that the scandal would be so great as to make reparation impossible, while a sacrifice would wash the crime away and send her right to Heaven.

Quest.: "Do you think that it is to the interest of the Church to have Schmidt declared insane?" Of course, I believe it. The Church, the relatives and the friends are interested in it. The plea of insanity is the only way to shake off responsibility. The man's insanity and the crime constitute a misfortune, which must be looked upon with pity as well as horror. In the case of a criminal priest or monk, the Church has two ways of escape—to conceal the crime, or to declare the criminal insane. The writer could point out to-day a doctor who issued two certificates of natural death in a convent when he was as positive as we were that the dead were murdered. I know of another instance when the crime became public, in spite of all measures taken to conceal it and the judge came to the convent, and there on the spot declared the lay brother who was the perpetrator of the crime to be insane. He was sent to an insane asylum, and before the year was over he was brought back to the convent sane and also saved from suffering his just penalty. The teaching is this: Mother Church receives an insult when one of her sons turns out to be bad. To try to punish the criminal for justice's sake if it cannot be done secretly means a new injustice to the Church on account of the injury she would suffer through such a scandal.

Quest.: "Has the Roman Church any law respecting jurors?" Yes, and I must say concerning its definition and principles that I doubt whether there is any body of laws more in agreement with the principles of justice and truth. In the Roman Church there is a great difference between the law and its application. This is where she shows her skill to deceive. It is like this: I have seen advertised a book, entitled "Thirty-two Thousand Ways to Escape the Law." I have not read the book, but the title shows that however good we may consider a law, if there are thirty-two thousand ways to escape it legally, justice and truth must be very far from the whole legislature. Rome likewise establishes a principle to which no sensible person can object, but the trouble is that after making the law she teaches over two hundred thousand ways to escape the law. Again, you cannot judge the Church by an isolated law for a particular case. If you do you are liable to be misled. You have to know all her massive work on *juris canonici* to know her real conception of law. If a priest should read to you from any theology what the Church teaches concerning jurors you probably would think that the safest way to arrive at a just and true verdict would be to secure a Catholic jury, and yet I can assure you that no one, if he is a good Catholic, could condemn a man whom, in spite of his crime, the Church wishes to save. I cannot treat this question at length now; it would require a presentation of what the Church says with regard to authority and jurisdiction, the oath, mental reservation, virtue, duties respecting priests, etc., etc. All this it is necessary to study to see that the beautiful definition of the duties of the jury is only a farce. As we cannot go over all these laws, let us take as an illustration a particular case.

The Church teaches: "That any Catholic serving as a juror or witness in a *properly constituted court* is bound to swear and to say what he knows to be *absolute truth* regardless of the consequences. This is all very good. But as in the treatises referred to she also teaches that there is no properly constituted authority but that which comes through the proper channel — that is, from God to the pope, and from

the pope to the judges; and as she still further teaches that an unqualified judge cannot require a true oath, and that one may also swear with reservation to an unqualified judge, I do not know of any secular tribunal in the world where a juror would not feel himself exempt from the obligation of telling the truth. But the most difficult thing is to know what is absolute truth according to the Church. The theologians treat at great length of absolute, virtual and moral truth, but according to their definition no human being can possibly attain the knowledge of absolute truth even with regard to the fact of his own existence.

St. Bonaventura presents the following case attributed to St. Francis: The saint was asked, "Father, if you should see a priest committing a crime could you deny it under oath?" "Yes," he answered. "First, because the senses are not the proper means whereby to arrive at the absolute truth, many persons having been deceived by them. Second, because at the same time that I saw him committing the crime the Holy Ghost might have given him a true repentance, which would remove the guilt from him; in which case, by condemning him, I would sin against justice. Besides, we know that many times the devil has taken the form of a priest to ruin the Lord's servants." The theologians ask: "May any one who sees a priest committing a sin swear that he believes him to be insane?" "Certainly he may. Insanity, according to the best authorities, is nothing but a derangement of the mind (the mind out of its place). The priest's soul and body being consecrated to his holy office, his mind is out of place when he commits a sin; therefore he might properly be considered insane. And we believe that a man so consecrated to the Lord's service cannot sin except through natural insanity or diabolical possession. So we believe, contrary to Bon, Suar and Kon, that the witness of such a sin may testify upon oath that he believes the priest to be insane. And note that this obligation is not by virtue of charity alone, but by the requirement of justice."—Le Croix. But here is another question: All the theologians agree that the juror, in case the guilt has been proven without question, judicially, is bound only to his conscience, not to

the conclusions of the law. Now, suppose the juror wishes to save a person, all he needs to know is that the accused has been to confession after committing the crime. He can ascertain this by asking the priest, and if he is denied that privilege, or wishes to avoid suspicion, any conventional sign made by the priest in passing is sufficient to assure him that such was the case. Then, as absolution makes of the penitent a new creature, the juror can swear that, "This man now before me is innocent." In the same way a guilty wife, after confession, can swear to her husband that she is innocent, provided that she really is so since her last confession.

In my experience I can assure my readers that no Catholic juror who, in spite of evidence in the case of a death sentence, has sided with the accused, ever had any regret for it. He thought that he had been the means of allowing opportunity for repentance, etc. And on the other hand, I have seen no Catholic juror who has condemned a criminal, however just the condemnation may have been, who has not been troubled and sorry afterward for his action.

And that the reader may see the elasticity of the laws of the Church of Rome I know of a case in which a cardinal wanted to ruin a rival of his, and took the argument the other way. He went to a simple sister and asked her if Father So-and-So ever did anything to her, like holding her hand. She said: "Yes, but not with evil purpose." The old man was familiar with the sisters in a fatherly way, but he was perfectly moral. The cardinal said to the nun, "No matter what you think about it, all such things tend to ultimate end — immorality." Jesus said: "He that looketh upon a woman . . . has committed, . . ." so you can affirm that he is guilty. The cardinal made her sign a paper that Father So-and-So attacked her, with immoral purposes; and it brought about the ruin of the old father. This nun is to-day the Superior-General of her order, and resides in Rome. I have no doubt the cardinal promoted her and transferred her to Rome, with the purpose of preventing her falling under the influence of a just confessor, who would oblige her to retract.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN POLITICS

An Echo from the Election

To the Editor of "The Springfield Daily Republican":

The last sentence of your editorial of the 31st ult., under the caption, "The Voters and Religious Tests"—"the principle of no religious tests for public office is a corner-stone of the State," is unquestionably correct. But on what does this principle rest? On a principle more broad and fundamental still. Why shall there be no religious tests? Because the State has no use for officers to teach religion. To teach religion is not the function of the State. This is the bedrock on which our civil and religious liberties in America solidly repose. The union of Church and State, with the inevitable conflicts between the civil and ecclesiastical powers was the immeasurable calamity and curse of the world for centuries. Every acre of Europe was drenched with human gore by religious wars. Guizot says that the Lutheran Reformation was a revolt from the tyranny of the ecclesiastical power. But it did not destroy or end the union of Church and State nor wars growing out of that union. The Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) was a religious war spreading a desolation from which Europe did not recover in two centuries. Our fathers were driven to this country by ecclesiastical tyranny. Yet continued the union of Church and State. But it proved so utterly impracticable in a democracy that it was, with great misgivings, abolished in Connecticut in 1818, and later in Massachusetts and elsewhere. Lyman Beecher, then at the height of his great power, opposed the new measure; but forty years afterward he wrote: "For several days I suffered more than tongue can tell for the best thing that ever happened to the State of Connecticut. No longer was the State to teach religion. The Roman hierarchy has always opposed the dissolution of the union of Church and State. It has always been active in politics. It is as clearly a political as an ecclesiastical organization. The self-imprisonment of the pope in the Vatican is a demand for civil supremacy. And millions all over the world join with him in his demand and admire him for the sacrifice of his personal liberty. Some years ago Archbishop Ireland went to Rome, and so popular was he in this country that the press widely predicted that he would

return with a cardinal's hat. But it appeared soon that he went not to be honored but to be disciplined. Unfortunately he had shown something of an American spirit in relation to the public schools in Faribault, Minn. A few weeks after reaching Rome he was compelled to publish a disavowal of all Modernism, practically withdrawing from his former attitude, and soon after his return to America he published an article in the "North American Review" advocating the restoration of civil authority to the pope. Thus he was subjugated. It must have been a bitter pill for the archbishop, for when papal supremacy over the States of the Church existed, the pope exercised his authority in recognizing the Southern Confederacy, being the only civil ruler in the world that did so.

Again I affirm that the Roman hierarchy is a political organization, and wherever it can it enters politics. We are troubled about corporations. The Roman hierarchy is the biggest corporation in the world. The United States steel is a baby to it. We are troubled by bossism. The pope is the biggest political boss on the planet. Mark Hanna is nowhere beside him. He has shown his hand in the Italian elections and authorized and encouraged French Romanists to violate certain laws of the republic within three weeks. The Roman hierarchy in the United States has for forty years denounced one of the most important institutions which is established by the State—our public-school system. Is not that dipping into politics? It has demanded in all these years that the States should support their parochial schools—in other words, that the State should teach religion. Is not the hierarchy a political body? Is it not assailing a fundamental principle of our free institutions? Is it not at the present time a strong factor in our electorate avowedly purposing to carry a political measure through our Legislature? a vote to secure from the State financial support for religious schools.

Look at it. About three years ago at a large convention of clergy and laymen in St. Louis it was voted that the time had come to enter upon a vigorous aggressive campaign to secure State support for schools in which the priest teaches religion. Noting this announced purpose, eminent citizens of Massachusetts brought before the Legislature an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the granting of public money

to sectarian institutions of any kind. It was ably pleaded for before the committee and no one appeared against it. The hierarchy, with its allies, however, was on hand, and in the House only sixteen voted for it and 170 against it! No man seeking political preferment dare incur the disfavor of the Roman priesthood by protesting against the State being dragged into medieval union with the Church to teach religion.

Not long after this legislative attitude was taken Rev. Thomas A. McGovern, of this city, before an audience of Romanists, referring to the distinguished gentleman who had proposed the amendment with scorn as "narrow and bigoted," declared that in regard to the parochial schools the Church is not going to back down, and noting several facts indicating Roman progress in the acquisition of political power boasted that the Church now controls sixty-five per cent. of the votes of the State, and predicted an early achievement of their purpose. Evidently one of the tests which the priest imposes on a candidate for public office is a religious one. The question is what religion does he stand for?

During the congressional campaign in 1912 Cardinal O'Connell was reported as visiting the pope, and the latter asked many questions, evincing deep interest in our approaching election. In the result it appeared that of the 162 new members chosen to Congress a very unusual number were of the Roman Catholic Church. A very singular occurrence was the election of five Romanists as the entire delegation from Connecticut—that is, fifty per cent. of the electorate secured 100 per cent. of the elected. A gentleman who has investigated the matter finds that about one-third of the members of the present Congress are members of the Roman Church, one-third members of Protestant Churches and the remainder, not members, but more or less affiliated with Protestant Churches. That is, three-twenty-fourths of the population of the United States have secured eight-twenty-fourths of the places of power. No wonder the pope was interested in that election. Really, the usually astute "Republican" falls into a very somnolent condition when it says of the fact that the entire delegation of Connecticut is representative of the Roman hierarchy, "It is of no consequence whatever. It is one of the facts that 'just happens.'" Yea, verily: The Roman hierarchy, with the balance of power, knows just when

and how to make such things happen. Some will see in the outcome of the election of 1912 the reason and the result of the pope's reported interest in it. It showed that the campaign ordained in 1910 at St. Louis is on. The election just held demonstrates the same.

A favorite slogan—I heard it first forty years ago in Cleveland, O., from the lips of the eminent Bishop Gilmour—is “Catholics first and citizens afterward!” It sounds very religious, but it is a rule of political action. It means that when the political policy of the political hierarchy conflicts with any political policy of the commonwealth, Catholics will vote with the former even against so fundamental a principle as that the State shall not teach religion. At the present time the Catholics are living up to their essential principles. To vote against them as candidates for public office is not against their religion but against their politics. Just as when I vote against a Methodist, or Congregationalist, or Episcopalian I do not vote against his religion but against his politics. Just at the present time Catholics stand for a political measure which is unconstitutional and destructive of the rights and liberties of a free people. The commonwealth must not teach religion.

A personal word. My first vote was for John C. Fremont. My second and third for President were for Abraham Lincoln, my last was for William H. Taft. Yet I am not a “hide-bound” Republican. I have voted for a Democrat occasionally. I am a Protestant. I believe with Paul, “For freedom hath Christ set us free.” I try to “use my freedom as not abusing it.” So I have sometimes voted for Roman Catholics, though not when they avowed what seemed to me mistaken policies. In recent years in this city I have voted for two men, both of whom are both loyal Democrats and Roman Catholics—William P. Hayes and James Carroll, candidates for Mayor. I have always had friends in the Roman Church, and admire many of whom I have known, and I agree with Father Tyrrell, a noble Christian brother, who wrote that “controversy is an important way of ascertaining and establishing the truth,” but it must be conducted in a very kindly and truth-loving spirit. True, his use of controversy in that spirit incurred the wrath of the papal court, and he who has the “power of the keys” excommunicated him and locked the gate of Heaven against him.

Now, my dear "Republican," excuse me, but please leave the practise of stigmatizing me and other men of like opinions, with opprobrious epithets, such as "narrow and bigoted," and the like, to passionate and vulgar partisans, and when you greet me in the morning play the gentleman that you are, like any other guest at my breakfast table.

SAMUEL H. LEE.

MONEY UNDER FALSE PRETENCES

BY L. Q.

We read constantly in the papers of some unfortunate man or woman being arrested for obtaining money under false pretences, when, perhaps, all either of them has done is to give advice, good, bad, or indifferent, to some anxious person who may benefit by it or not, according mainly to his own individuality, for a very insignificant sum. They generally get quite as much as they paid for, and sometimes the advice is well worth the money.

If these comparatively harmless people, who are simply endeavoring to make enough to keep body and soul together, which we are all striving to do, and many of us by far less honest methods, are guilty in the eyes of the law, why should not cardinals, archbishops and priests be arrested on the same grounds? They take money—and not little sums like 25 cents or 50 cents, but as much as they think they dare ask—for masses to get souls out of purgatory, or as far on the way as the money will pay for; as traveling in purgatory is very costly and very slow apparently, some persons having been hundreds of years making the journey, and they are not out yet.

If this is not getting money under false pretences I should like to know by what euphonious name you might call it. It is not even good business, for these same cardinals, archbishops, and priests do not "deliver the goods." Who ever saw a soul that they had brought out of purgatory? Yet they are allowed to carry on this nefarious traffic with impunity, not to keep the wolf from the door, as in the case of the poor clairvoyants, who really give something in return for the money, but for the aggrandizement of the Church of Rome and its officials.

Why should not this matter be taken up by the courts as well as the minor misdemeanor? Are they also in the power of Rome?

LETTER TO CARDINAL GIBBONS

XXIII.

My dear Cardinal:

Some of the highest authorities of your own Church, such as those we cited in our last letter, relieve us of the necessity of advancing any further arguments, as our position is amply justified by them. Nevertheless, there is such a profound lesson in every little detail of the Church's dogma and discipline that we feel bound to continue our subject for the benefit of our readers.

It is logical to expect that those who have carefully followed the course of these letters should ask: What reason had the present pope for removing Boniface VI from the Catalogue of the Popes, when he allowed Stephen II, whose claims are even less valid, to remain? But it requires a knowledge of the interior workings of your Church to be able to answer such a question,—and it is impossible to acquire such a knowledge merely through the study of books which treat of her theology and dogmas. One must become thoroughly acquainted with the men who direct her course and dictate her policy.

Apart from the fact that the cancellation of Boniface VI involves a very important question in the political history of the Vatican Curia, the reader may here have the opportunity of observing some of the ways of the Church, which plainly reveal her cunning.

If Pope Pius X had issued a decree that all the popes whose investiture is not recorded should be cancelled, he would have been confronted with the most difficult problem the Church ever encountered. And, as the Church sustains two schools upon every question, this matter would have been debated at such length that it would require centuries to arrive at any conclusion. Meanwhile the question of succession would remain uncertain, pending the final conclusion of the debating schools. Of course, that would mean simply this: If the party in favor of investiture should win, the great majority of the popes on the present list would have to be cancelled, especially all those earlier than the thirteenth century; while, if the victory should be gained by the party not requiring investiture, those who, for political reasons, the Church has declared to be anti-popes would have to be put

on the list, and, consequently, all the accepted list, including the present pope, would have to be declared spurious. This is the conclusion that Cardinal Vives and I arrived at some years ago.

Now the pope has adopted the "*peccata minuta*" system. That is to say, he has removed four popes as quietly as possible, in order not to attract attention. He wished also, no doubt, to ascertain whether the question with regard to the line of apostolic succession, so greatly agitated some years ago, would arouse the same strife between the rival schools to-day. He cancelled Boniface VI, but allowed the others, whose claims were far less valid canonically, to stand. The object of this step is plain. It could be called a *peccata minuta* (a little sin) and if passed unnoticed now, it would open a door for the next pope, giving him liberty to interpret the canons at will, by the law of precedent, which is very strong in the Roman Curia. Let us suppose that Cardinal Mery del Val succeeds in propitiating to such an extent the saints of his particular devotion, that they will exercise their powers, already proven so efficacious in his behalf, so that, before the next conclave, all obstacles to his obtaining an election to the papacy shall be removed. And let us further suppose (although we do not believe it will be so) that Cardinal Mery del Val actually becomes the next pope; what an easy door he finds open for him to do what he pleases! Suppose, in some future conclave, there should arise a serious question concerning the election, such as I am sure would have arisen since the death of Cardinal Oreglia, if Rampolla had not also died. If, for any reason, it should not be possible to solemnly invest the next pope, if his party were in power he would be declared pope "*according to the use of the Church and the custom of our predecessors; who granted such privilege to Stephen the Second, and many others.*" Suppose that, on the contrary, his enemies were in power and wished to get rid of him, they would say, "We declare such a man to be an intruder and unworthy of occupying the papal throne, according to what was established by our worthy predecessor of holy memory, Pius the Tenth, *who removed Boniface the Sixth from the list of popes for similar reasons.*" Of course, whichever way they take will be in conformity with the canons. And we have here the explanation of how it has been possible for the Church to condemn some men

to hell for having taught the same things for which others went to Heaven and are even venerated upon the altars.

The Church, Cardinal, wishes to be always upon a sure footing. She is afraid of making any mistake and that is why she takes so much care to have *reliable* and *venerable* authorities upon each side of every question. This reminds me of an old father, one of our professors, who used to say: "The world looks upon us as prophets, or men who cannot make a mistake. Take great care not to prophesy, but if you do, do it in such a way that you may always be in the right. If you say that to-morrow there is going to be sunshine, say it in such a way that if it should rain you would still be right, and if you predict that it will rain, even if there is sunshine, your prophesy will not be found at fault." This is the whole secret of the policy of your Church.

And now, returning to the popes, the next on the list is Stephen III. This pope furnishes a splendid subject for the writing of a book. To him can be traced the present policy of your Church. He filled the Church with bloodshed and opened her doors to fraud and despotism. He is the first who attempted to establish the temporal power, the cause of so many crimes, for which the Church can never atone.

St. Paul I, who succeeded him, was with all certainty an intruder. He had no election at all. He was the brother of Stephen III, and taking advantage of Stephen's influence with Pepin, he simply took possession of the papal throne upon his brother's death.

Stephen IV owes his dignity, not to any election, but to his having permitted the polygamy of the *holy* Charlemagne.

Adrian I, Leo III, Stephen V and Pascal I are celebrated for their intrigues, cruelty and corruption. We cannot look upon the pages of their history without horror. These monsters stopped at nothing in the pursuit of their one aim and object, the supremacy of the papacy. While their friends were let loose to commit all manner of crimes, there was no cruelty human barbarism could invent which was not employed against those who would not submit to them. No wonder many of your historians trace the beginning of the Inquisition back to this period.

Eugene II was, according to the list of popes, the successor of Pascal I. We believe that his election was no more than a sham. He was an anti-pope, who by intrigues, simony and cruelty usurped the papal throne. These are the facts, which none of your historians can deny with any satisfactory proof: First: That he was not elected. Second: That he established the ordeal of cold water to prove innocence. Third: That he was obliged to acknowledge that his predecessors had stolen the property of the people, and he was compelled also to acknowledge to be fraudulent the celebrated donations of Constantine, Pepin and Charlemagne to the papacy. Fourth: That he established the punishment of death by starvation in place of the accepted form of capital punishment. Fifth: That he was so zealous in forcing upon the churches the use of images that the churches of Spain and France refused obedience to him for two reasons, i. e.: because he was not canonically elected and because, by his anti-Christian spirit of introducing images, he showed that he had departed from the doctrines of the Apostles.

In closing this letter allow me, Cardinal, to make some remarks. You claim that your Church is Unam (one), that the popes are the successors, in direct line, of St. Peter. History and common sense teach us the contrary. The papal system, far from showing any divine origin, shows plainly how far human ambition can go. Intrigues and crime have been the ladder to the papal throne. Your conquests are a shame to the Church, which never could gather the people to herself except through fear. You have conquered the bodies of men, but history teaches us that you could not conquer the souls. Between vexations, torture and death and submission to the Church the people chose to surrender to the Church, although they hated her. The best and boldest dared to face the consequences and protested against the abuses of the Church, as happened at the introduction of images, but their voices had no echo and died away under the cruelty and persecution of those who called themselves representatives of Christ. A good way of preserving unity!

May God open your eyes and awaken in your heart a hunger for that unity with Christ which alone can give us peace.

MANUEL FERRANDO.



Bishop Robert L. Rudolph, M.A., D.D.,
President of the Board of Trustees
of
Christ's Mission.

THE POPE'S LIBERTY

BY CHARLES EATON.

Just prior to the pope's recent illness he addressed nearly 2,000 pilgrims in the great hall, on the liberty of the Church. "It is truly painful," said the pope, "that we, amid all the vaunted progress of civilization and in all the light of modern knowledge, must ask in vain for the Church, even from Christian Governments, that liberty which they themselves recognize, or should recognize, as necessary for the unfolding of her supernatural action on earth. . . . The Church is a kingdom which knows no master but God and whose mission is so high that it crosses all boundaries and forms into one family all people of every tongue and nation. . . . In the spiritual order the Church is superior to all sovereignties on earth, and it is her duty to protest against all who would limit her work for souls. . . . The Church has the mission to teach the observance of the Commandments and to exhort all to the practise of the evangelical councils."

The pope has ideas about himself that are stupendous and queer. If he is fenced in he did it himself with posts and boards of his own arrogance, bigotry and intolerance. No State objects to his teaching the Ten Commandments. He can hold perpetual camp-meetings for that purpose in New Jersey or New Hampshire any time he wishes. But there is a difference between teaching people not to lie and steal, and exhorting them to destroy republican government and the benign institutions of modern civilization by practising the hellish anathemas and intolerance enjoined by the councils of Trent and of the Vatican. There is a rankling repugnance between scheming to build an ecclesiastical monarchy in all our States and instructing the people in the moral wisdom of the Commandments; a difference between teaching American Catholics the infamous precepts in the Syllabus of 1864 and in the catechism of the Baltimore Council and inculcating the doctrines and ideals written in our Bill of Rights and Constitution; there is a malignant and mighty difference between teaching the Commandments and consigning Americans to hell for leading brides to our marriage altars—consigning them to hell for joining our benevolent organizations,

using our freedom of speech and freedom of press and for worshipping in our churches; there is a difference between teaching the Commandments and damning our Catholic fellow citizens to endless anguish for using and honoring our sacred rights and free institutions.

Listen to Jesus' description of His mission as recorded in His very first sermon in Nazareth: "He (the Lord) hath annointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised." This same benevolent commission is the one He gave His disciples—all His followers: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you"—you, a religious democracy, a democracy of women as well as men; not an ecclesiastical monarchy, not an autocracy. Call no man master; exercise no lordship; these were His commands. He said, bind sin, not men. "Whosoever sins ye retain"—"sins" is the word, not men—"are retained." And it was neither Peter alone nor His apostles alone to whom He gave His authority. He gave His authority to His disciples, the women as well as the men; for it was His "disciples" He was addressing. (Matt. 18: 1, 18; St. John 20: 19, 23).

On no page of Jesus' teachings is there a command to His apostles to challenge the jurisdiction of the Roman Empire; no command like that of the pope to his high priests in our country to thwart and defy the jurisdiction of the people over marriage, education, literature, justice and religion. In his general letter to the elect Peter himself echoed the spirit of Jesus' teachings. "Submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king as supreme or unto governors." "Let every soul"—and every soul includes the pope—"be subject unto the higher powers . . . for rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil," was the Apostle Paul's message to the Christians of Rome where the pope now resides; and Paul also charged Titus "to put the Cretans in mind to be subject to"—not himself or Titus or Peter but—"to principalities and powers; to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work."

The "spiritual order" over which the pope claims sovereignty is contrary to and repugnant to the benign office and merciful service marked out by Jesus in His sermon as above. The pope's

spiritual order savors of real estate, and of gold and silver made from purgatory, and from the sale of old bones, prayers, scapulars, dispensations and indulgences; the pope's spiritual order is encumbered with concordats that have enslaved European States and now shackle South American States. The pope's priests are more eager to haul in a big share of our tax-moneys for their crafty scheme and blighting system than to heal the broken-hearted; more eager to enforce segregation on Church lines at the peril of fraternity and social sympathy than to lift up the unfortunate and rescue the destitute from the slums and a life of crime; the hierarchs are more active in discrediting the Protestant Bible and in forbidding the laity to interpret the Catholic Bible than in preaching deliverance from captivity to strong drink and dens of evil; the pope's bishops are more determined to destroy our jurisdiction over faith and morals, boycott freedom of utterance and penalize religious freedom than to enlighten the laity, who are blinded by ignorance and superstition—more determined to extend the pope's dominion than to give liberty to the men and women bruised by monasticism and celibacy and ecclesiastical imposition. Menacing our Catholic fellow citizens with everlasting torture for using our sacred rights and hallowed institutions—damning citizens for loyalty to our country—as Cardinal Gibbons and the other hierarchs are doing, is working for satan and treason, and not for souls.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS

BY L. Q.

I would like to ask, through your columns, whether all the cardinals, bishops and priests of the Römish Church, who undertake to lay down laws for American citizens by interfering with our public school system, are themselves naturalized citizens, or whether they are still the subjects of a foreign hierarchy that is seeking to enslave the American people as it has enslaved the souls and bodies of men and women in every country where it has held sway?

Happily, many of these souls have awakened and thrown off the monstrous yoke, and in despair the hierarchy is now trying to enslave the United States, which seems to have for-

gotten the celebrated dictum: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," paraphrased from Curran's famous speech in 1790, in which he says: "The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition, if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt." This applies to us, for we seem to be sunk in a stupor of self-satisfaction, oblivious to the fact that Rome's tactics are those of the tiger who creeps stealthily and unsuspected upon its prey, and that, therefore, we need to have our watchfires burning and our weapons in readiness to defend ourselves against its cunning advances.

Wake up, Protestants, and do not yield one inch of the liberties for which countless thousands of your devoted religious ancestors in Switzerland, Germany, Holland, France, Spain, Italy, England, etc., spilt their blood and yielded up their lives, some languishing for years in cruel dungeons until death mercifully relieved their sufferings! Have you no spirit, no pride; have you no self-respect? It would seem not, if you supinely allow your soul-liberty to be mocked and trampled underfoot by an arrogant political power posing under the guise of religion. Why should we allow our good money, contributed, in the main, by Protestants for the maintenance and preservation of our system of free education, to be appropriated by the Romish Church for the support of sectarian schools, for that is what it amounts to? If they desire these schools, let the Roman Catholics build and support them out of their own pockets, and not try to sneak away good Protestant money to enable them to condemn the very "heretics" from whom they obtained it; for even in desiring these parochial schools they are condemning the Protestants and the public schools. It is the old story of trying to get hold of public money for private purposes, and should certainly not be permitted. If it is permitted, then all the "malefactors of great wealth" who have been raked over the coals were absolutely justified, and should not have been punished. Let us be logical, even if we cannot be honest!

In any case, what right has an alien Church, with an alien head, to moneys contributed by the Government of this country for the support of free institutions?

IMMUNITY OF THE PRIEST

BY BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D.

When the *motu proprio* of the pope was issued we promised our readers to write on this subject. Accumulated material, the limits of our publication and our desire to give preference to other writers, besides our many other duties, have delayed the accomplishment of our promise.

We said then that we thought this *motu proprio* was far more damaging to the morals of this country than the "*Ne temere*" Decree. We still believe so, and we shall give our reasons.

That so many papers have said the contrary, relying on the text of our laws and of our legal proceedings, only shows that the writers have not realized the nature of the "*motu proprio*," or do not understand the mind of the Church on this subject. Far from thinking as they do, we are convinced that the most pernicious principles of the interpretation of the laws of the Church of Rome spring out of this very doctrine of the immunity of the priest, from which the *motu proprio* receives its canonical sanction. To it Rome owes her success, and we know of no country in which the civil law can counteract its effects. To attack it is to attack the very root of the Roman system. And we know no other means of attacking this pernicious doctrine but by educating the masses to a high standard of honesty above the Church, and in spite of the Church.

In these articles, as in all our writings, we purpose to give to our readers the benefit of our own personal experience. We purpose to give the history of the doctrine of immunity, its beginning and development; the claims of the Church in this respect, how it perverts the morals of any country, and also how impossible it is for the law of the land to do anything to prevent the evil.

We are convinced that there is urgent need for a careful study of this subject. The case of Father Schmidt, which has had an international publicity and brought a stain upon our country; the case of Father Rivera, who escaped the law by leaving the country, and who also left behind him a poor girl in disgrace, while he is enjoying in some other land of our possession the privileges of his priesthood; the case of a girl shut up in a convent without the consent of her parents, who could not obtain an interview with their only child, even registered

letters sent to her having been returned marked "*Present address unknown*"; the many cases that are brought to light every day, make these articles not only timely but necessary. The worst sign of the times which causes us to foresee the ruin of this country, unless radical measures are adopted, is the fact that the danger of the Roman system is so little realized. Its prelates are characterized as the most conscientious men filled with the best of purposes. No one realizes that they have been the originators of the Inquisition, the destroyers of human liberties and happiness, and the devastators of the mental, social and moral life of every land where they have held sway, and that all their present efforts and claims tend to restore to the Church her old privileges, and to bring back to the world the darkness of the Middle Ages!

We believe, and history justifies our opinion, that the first effort of the mind which wakes up to the realization of its God-given individuality and capabilities is directed toward shaking off the yoke of the Church of Rome. Italy, France, Spain and the Spanish dependencies confirm this. But we also believe that the first sign of spiritual blindness is the loss of the ability to discern between good and evil; the first sign of mental apathy is the setting aside of questions of supreme importance; the first sign of national decadence and ruin is forgetfulness of the origin or cause of our glories, throwing into oblivion national traditions, and making compact with the enemies against whom our heroes fought.

Our readers will excuse this long digression in our preliminary article, as it is caused by our great desire to impress on their minds the idea that we are moved, not by any sectarian prejudice, but by the realization of the danger that threatens. We know that the apparent concessions of the Roman Church in this country are mere conventionalism, in order to work her way. We are sure that her object in conquering this nation, as the most enlightened in the world, is to stop, if possible, the rapid advance of modern ideas in countries ruined by her despotic power, and which are now struggling for their independence. That America, the standard-bearer of the world's light and liberty should so far forget her high calling as to welcome the very arch-enemy of light and liberty is a significant fact. I wish our law-makers, who are so lenient in making little

concessions to-day, could realize what their present leniency means for the future of the nation. Even to-day we know of homes in which happiness and peace have been destroyed by the disappearance of some beloved one behind the bars of a convent. To apply to the Church is to receive insult instead of comfort, and if the protection of the civil law is sought its power does not reach beyond the walls of the convent, which also practically enjoys immunity.

As a new departure, a secret order has been issued from the Vatican to induce all Governments to make a law declaring void the marriage of an ex-priest. Of the Church succeeding in this at the present time we are not afraid. The tendency of all Governments is to the contrary. Even Spain is working to have the existing law to this effect removed. But it will never be removed in any country where the *motu proprio* concerning immunity is in force, as this deprives the Government of the power to legislate with regard to a priest. Although it is not probable that Rome will be able to induce any Government to pass such a law as above mentioned, a step has, nevertheless, been taken toward the accomplishment of her purpose. We have private letters informing us that Rome is becoming very active in her efforts to bring back the ex-priests into her subjection. We know of several cases in foreign parts, notably one in Porto Rico and one in Spain. In the case of the Porto Rican, Rome's efforts were unsuccessful, but in Spain the ex-priest was induced to return to the communion of the Church, being allowed to retain his wife, but not to perform his priestly office. Another ex-priest, engaged in evangelical work, is being hard pressed to return to Mother Church. The representatives of Rome have arranged with both theman's family and that of his wife to have the wife and child go back to her parents and the husband return to the convent, the Church at the same time making promises to support the wife and child, which, to say the least, are doubtful of fulfilment.

There can be no doubt that the same kind of thing is going on in the United States, and when the Church cannot induce an ex-priest to return she resorts to falsehood concerning him, as in the case of Father Buell. In the "Evening Journal," January 8, 1914, appeared the following:

Washington, January 8.—Father David Hillhouse Buell, former president of Georgetown University, who left the Jesuits a year ago and married, has sent his wife to a Catholic home and he has

secluded himself in the Trappist Monastery at Gethsemane, near Bardstown, Ky.

The Trappists keep a rigid silence that is broken only by religious chant and the morning greeting: "Memento mori," meaning "Remember death." Each day they remove a little of the dirt from the hole that is to be their grave.

Father Buell was reared in the Episcopal faith was graduated from Yale. He became a Catholic and joined the Jesuits.

Father Buell met Miss Frances Powers, of New York, while she was attending her brother, who was sick at the University Hospital. Powers was then a scholastic under Father Buell, and he has since been ordained a Jesuit priest. Two of his sisters are in a Catholic convent.

Father Buell and Miss Powers corresponded for several years. He was relieved of the presidency of the college, and after work at St. Aloysius' Church, in this city, was removed to a small parish in Eastern Maryland. He then notified his provincial that he would leave the Jesuit order, and a few weeks later he married Miss Powers. They took an apartment in New York, and he is supposed to have derived assistance from members of his family, who are wealthy.

It is presumed in the monastery that he has been received under probation, and if he perseveres in a determination to reassert his priestly functions he may be allowed to join the Trappist brotherhood.

Father Buell has since published a denial, declaring this story to be false, and saying also that he is living with his wife, and has no intention of ever returning to the Roman Church, much less to a Trappist Monastery. The Catholic papers, however, naturally would not give any publicity to the denial, that the effect of the falsehood already given so much publicity in their papers might remain undiminished.

In other cases of which I have personal knowledge priests who have left the Church have been declared to be insane, and the story has been implicitly believed by many credulous Catholics, although the proofs to the contrary were patent to every one else.

We earnestly wish that the American public would awake to the fact that all such cases indicate the determination of Rome to prove to the world, regardless of the actual facts, that the priest who becomes an apostate to her can find no peace or rest until he returns, and that usually the cause of his leaving her is either a depraved character or an unbalanced mind.

In other words, Rome, knowing neither justice nor impartiality, seeks only to establish undisputed and absolute dominion.

What respect can such a Church command from a free, just and independent people?

In our next issue we purpose to give the history of the doctrine of priestly immunity.

EVOLUTION OF WOMAN'S SITUATION IN THE PHILIPPINES

BY FILICIDAD C. GUERRERO.

When we look back and trace the position of woman in the Philippines long before the Spaniards came we find that she was treated the same as cattle or any animal of the same sort.

This fact was plainly shown when fathers and mothers sat in circles, selling their sons and daughters, and at the same time watched the chimney-like smoke of their pipes, saying, as they chatted and laughed loudly, "My son is a good hunter; would you like him to be your son-in-law?"

"Oh, yes! how much money can you afford to give me for my daughter?" used to be the reply.

The father of the boy would answer, "Well, as much as my son can earn in ten years, that is ten pesos."

At that very moment the bargain was completed, and the next day the ceremony took place in the home of the bridegroom.

This was followed by marriage feasts, which took place in the home of the bridegroom, then in the bride's. Both feasts were begun by killing pigs, and the old man and woman ate and drank. The feast in the bride's house was ended by the giving of the money by the father or the mother of the bridegroom to the parents of the bride. The next day, or sometime in the week, the newly married couple would go to the home of the bridegroom.

Then the new phase of the bride's life began. From morning till night she did not have any rest. She was the cook, washer-woman, had to work in the fields, took care of her children and the domestic animals; in short, she was the one who maintained the family.

What about the husband; what was he doing? He spent his time in hunting, sleeping, drinking and sometimes gambling. He did not plant at all to provide anything for future use to help his poor bought servant; that is, his wife, as he so considered her to be, nor to educate his children. How much the woman of to-day should thank our Heavenly Father she was not the woman of the past.

The poor wife, being so ignorant, conducted the home affairs

very poorly. The houses were not properly ventilated, because, when going out in the fields they had to close all the windows till they came back, and at night the windows were closed again for fear of the evil spirits. They were often neglected, unclean and unsanitary. The young were poorly clothed and fed. They used little clothing, and were often unclean. The little earnings of the mother were often wasted because she was entirely ignorant of the food value of what she was buying.

What was the fruit of such a life? Very many children died before maturity. The ones remaining were just as ignorant as their parents. They easily imitated the bad treatment by their father of the poor mother. As they grew older very many of them added more to the heavy burden of their mother, for they were not industrious and good children.

Generation after generation such ignorant people brought forth children of their kind. The Government was in its primitive state, for the young, upon whom the futurity of an island depended, were not educated.

The women were very ignorant concerning places outside of the barrio in which they lived. They were always working, and did not have the opportunity of going a little farther away from home. Very often they did not know all their neighbors. They never attempted to go to societies. Their only enjoyment was when their toil was finished successfully and their earning was enough for the day's support; they took their babies in their arms, lighted their pipes and talked and laughed while they tried to make their babies laugh, and at the same time watched the cloud-like smoke of their tobacco. The poor wife was contented when she knew that her husband had enough food. When he came home from hunting he would go at once to bed instead of scolding and whipping her because her earnings were not enough to support the family.

This was a very dark age in the epoch of our history, but a new and better era was coming near. That was, the discovery of the Philippines by the Spaniards. The Spaniards Christianized the people, and after a while a new and much better condition was given to woman. Marriages were still mainly agreed upon by the parents, but the women were treated as wives, not as slaves.

During such a critical period, when the division of labor was becoming distinct, the men had awakened and turned over a new leaf. Most of them got busy and became supporters instead of being supported by their bought slaves, or wives. The daughters of the well-to-do were allowed to go to public schools or obtain an education through other means, yet their education was limited to some extent. They were seldom allowed to obtain a profession of any sort. The highest I know of was teaching. Most of them were allowed to learn only reading and writing, for it was believed that education was not very necessary for girls. There is no doubt but that such girls lacked social, intellectual and spiritual training. They were housekeepers, but their home affairs were not conducted as well as they should have been, due to the lack of experience and education.

The daughters of the rich were symbolized by having soft hands and very fine fingers; or, in other words, hard work of any kind was not in any way appreciated by them. When they went out they depended upon their servants to carry their things and to help them in dressing. They seldom went out to see what was taking place in their own provinces. The women of that generation did not believe that it is only through hard and earnest labor that we can obtain true and everlasting happiness.

To-day men and women see things from a different standpoint, and without the aid of both men and women the complicated problems which are always going on in our daily lives will never, never be solved, was not realized by our forefathers. It had never been thought of how much influence the women could give to their children, upon whom our future depends.

But another age was approaching, an epoch of struggle and ambition. During this age, when the Philippine Government came under the flag of the United States, a large stream of an ever-increasing volume of students poured into the public schools. This student body was composed of boys and girls—rich and poor alike. The motto of every one was, "The survival of the fittest." It was through struggle that ambition was awakened, and strength-regained victory won is the sweeter when is greater the obstacle overcome.

Step by step the women were walking toward the right path of prosperity and progress. The women now have a fair

idea of the islands in which they live, and a little knowledge of the world. Now that the chain which bound the imprisoned intellect of women is broken they begin to compete with the men who were once their masters, and they are allowed to go abroad so as to better their condition through hard study and for the purpose of obtaining a profession.

After hard and earnest study, through experiences and from the people with whom they are in contact, they have obtained a thorough knowledge of sanitation and a general knowledge of many things. They are now leaving their windows open while sleeping, for the idea of evil spirits has disappeared from their minds; the usefulness of exercise is known; work is having a high place in the mind of the individual; spitting in public places is guarded against; the nuisances, as mosquitoes, flies, rats, etc., are being avoided. The causes of dysentery, cholera and other epidemic diseases are remedied, and many children are now reaching maturity.

Having all these qualifications, there is no doubt but that women are now having a better place in life, better social understanding and much more enjoyment. They are giving good and beneficial lessons to their children, the children are influencing the community, the community the Government and the Government our Philippines.—Philippine Observer.

FRIENDLY WARNING TO PARENTS

BY MADAME LOPEZ RODRIGUEZ, OF THE FIGUERAS MISSION, N. E.,
OF SPAIN.

Never was the need greater than in the present day for British parents to be on their guard against the insidious efforts of Rome to wile away their children from the good old Protestant faith, founded on God's Word, to maintain which our forefathers suffered imprisonment, torture and death at the stake. Shall we hold lightly what cost them their life-blood? It may be said, "Those days are past, and will not return in this enlightened twentieth century." God grant they may not; but be it known that one of Rome's truest mottoes regarding herself is that she "*changes not*." Give her back her temporal power, and with it would most certainly return the

holy office of the Inquisition, with all its horrors. In the present day she works *indirectly*, but *surely*, in our beloved country. Her Jesuit agents creep *disguised* into our pulpits, public schools, and even as governesses and servants, into our very homes! So cautiously do they carry out their plans that few are discovered till the evil is done, the thin end of the wedge is inserted so warily that only those who are on the alert can detect its presence.

One can hardly find a town or village in England where ritualism is not practised in a more or less advanced stage. People smile if you express fears on the subject; and should you venture a word of friendly *warning*, they reply, "Do not be uncharitable!" But when they *lose a son or daughter*, entrapped by Rome, they bewail too late their lack of perception and foresight.

The following case is authentic: A wealthy landed proprietor living at C—— has an only daughter, young, handsome and much beloved by her indulgent parents. They had for years attended the old parish church, where the Gospel was faithfully preached. A new curate arrived to assist the vicar of an adjoining parish. Having responded to the application of an "Evangelical," it was concluded that he *held* the view he *professed*. At first his ministry was in accordance with them; but *after gaining a hold* on the congregation, and finally established in a church of his own, *he came out in his true colors*, and introduced ritualistic innovations, such as flowers on the communion table, a crucifix, the confessional, etc. The older people shook their heads and *protested* that such practises were "*in direct opposition to the Articles of the Church of England*." Their remonstrances were, however, unheeded. The younger members of the congregation called their relatives "narrow-minded," etc. "As if there could be any possible harm," they urged, "in placing beautiful flowers on the altar," forgetting that

Oftentimes, to win us to our harm,
The instruments of darkness tell us truths,
Win us with honest trifles, to betray us
In deepest consequences!

The daughter of our wealthy friend before named was an enthusiastic admirer of the new vicar and his teaching. After attending his ministry for six months she was one day miss-

ing from her home. The family party assembled for dinner, but she did not appear. The gong resounded in vain. The maids, followed by the anxious parents, searched her bedroom and boudoir, but to no purpose. Men servants were sent off in all directions to make enquiries, but night closed on their unsuccessful efforts. The next morning a little note, addressed to her parents, was found on her toilet table and eagerly read by them. It told that when they would read it she would have "left the world" and *taken the veil in the Roman Catholic convent* of a neighboring town, and that the Bishop of C—— would have performed the ceremony. The short letter closed with words of affection, but not one word of regret for conduct so undutiful.

"If only we had not allowed her to leave off going with us to the dear old parish church to attend the curate's preaching! If only we had warned her against his ritualistic ways! But who would have thought she would ever have gone to Rome?"

Such, and many other were their mournful laments over the dear, lost, and only daughter! But, alas! *too late*. Some will urge that "young people will run after novelties; will have their own way." Is it not a sad retrogression in our "advanced age," this lack of respect to paternal authority? Is it not one of the "signs of the times" indicated by St. Paul in 2 Timothy 3: 1-5, "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves proud disobedient to parents without natural affection." The Romish Church professes to teach the commandment, "Honor thy father and thy mother," but unfortunately, her Jesuitical, ritualistic priests in many cases positively *inculcate the reverse*. The following is an authentic case in point:

A Sunday-school teacher, living in a popular watering place, had a flourishing class of elder girls. One of the pupils failing to attend she at once went to the girl's home to enquire the cause. Her grandparents were surprised on being questioned, as they supposed she had gone as usual to the Sunday-school. The two following weeks the girl was still missing from her class, and whenever the teacher attempted to find her she failed to do so. At the end of the time, however, she succeeded in meeting the truant, and affectionately asked her, in grieved

tones, how it was that one who had been so regular an attendant had so suddenly deserted the class. Touched even to tears the girl confessed that one day a young lady had begged her to go, "just for once," to a ritualistic church. She went, and was introduced to the vicar, who succeeded in persuading her to attend a "Guild Meeting," at which she was made much of by the curate, and, flattered by his attentions, consented to become a member. The ceremony of enrolling her was at once gone through. Standing on the altar steps she received from the vicar's hands a cross and book of devotions. On leaving the church, after having made the *necessary promises*, she was urged to conceal from her grandparents what had happened, and her timid filial reluctance to comply with such underhand conduct was met by the text: "*If any man hate not his father and his mother . . . he cannot be my disciple. And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.*" To save her from further ritualistic influences, at the earnest appeal to her grandparents, the Sunday-school teacher sent her to a distant town, where she was placed in service in a Christian Protestant family.

The greatest care is not only needed as to the *places of worship* our children attend, but also the schools in which they are educated. The following is one out of many cases which might be quoted to prove the necessity of caution in the matter: In a "Monthly Letter" published by the Protestant Alliance, the writer makes an extract from the Standard of May 26th, warning English Protestant families of the dangers incurred by sending their children to Roman Catholic establishments on the Continent. He writes: "One of the leading establishments in Bavaria for the education of young ladies is that known as the English Institute in Eichstatt. To this institute, which has many branches throughout Germany, I was induced to send my three daughters, aged eleven, thirteen and eighteen respectively, stipulating at the time that they should regularly attend a Protestant Church, and that the faith in which they had been brought up should not in any way be interfered with. I was startled a few days since upon hearing that my second daughter had been secretly baptized in the Roman Catholic Church, unknown even to her sisters; and that three daughters of a Scotch gentleman, sent there to be educated, had been induced to do the same, un-

known to their father. Upon making enquiries in the town of Eichstatt I find it has become quite a scandal in the place the number of English and other Protestant children, sent here to be educated, that have (*all unknown to their parents*) been secretly instructed and baptized in the Roman Catholic faith."

Now, let us look nearer home. London is completely encircled with Romish institutions, a spiritual environment which augurs serious danger to our Protestant Constitution and Faith.

Not only does this apply to the metropolis, but more or less to all parts of the United Kingdom. Take one case out of many which might be cited. That fine building in Farnborough, now a flourishing convent school, by whom is it attended? The daughters of our Protestant officers in Aldershot. Alas! for the indifference or credulity (both equally culpable) of the parents. The result of the education received from the nuns will surely be, in spite of protestations that the pupils "are not proselytized," a future generation of Romanists, in positions of wealth and influence. The difficulty may be urged as to where our sons and daughters can be sent with security. The author most warmly and unhesitatingly recommends the Moravian schools both in Britain and on the Continent. Information regarding Moravian educational institutions can be obtained from the headquarters of the Moravian Church in London, address Rev. W. Wetton Cox, at the offices of the London Association, 7 New Court, Lincoln's Inn, London, W. C. One of the many excellent regulations of these institutions is that of a weekly Bible class, held by the minister, in which the Scriptures are so carefully taught, that on leaving the pupils are not easily entrapped by the varied forms of error which assail them on every side. The *thorough and intelligent knowledge of God's Word*, thus carefully instilled, is the *best* and only sure safeguard against Romish error on the one hand, and infidelity on the other.

Rome may burn the precious "*Book Divine*," infidelity may scoff at and repudiate it, but those parents who, like Lois and Eunice of old, *teach their children from earliest years* the Holy Scriptures, which make wise unto salvation, will undoubtedly reap the reward of seeing them grow up, like Timothy, ornaments to their families, to the Church of Christ and a blessing to all around them.